

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
07/14/2000	Earl T. Crouch	3000-045	7150
04/10/2003			
PLLC		EXAMI	NER
7402		BEFUMO, JENNA LEIGH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1771	
		DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003	
	07/14/2000 04/10/2003 PLLC	07/14/2000 Earl T. Crouch 04/10/2003 PLLC	07/14/2000 Earl T. Crouch 3000-045  04/10/2003  PLLC EXAMI  7402  ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>)</b>			AS
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	09/616,616	CROUCH ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jenna-Leigh Befumo	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a			,
THE REPLY FILED 26 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to rinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this a : (1) a timely filed amendment oeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	application. A proper reply to a t which places the application in	ı . ued
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b	)]	
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exponent of the North Check THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY (10.07).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The expiration of the expiration of the expiration date of the content of the expiration of the expiration of the content of the expiration of th	oire later than SIX MONTHS from the NAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS.  The date on which the petition under the corresponding of the shortened statutory period for Office later than three months after	e mailing date of the final rejection.  S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See Mire and the appropriate of the appropriate of the appropriate or reply originally set in the final Office a	PEP extension extension action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 c)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or se	arch (see NOTE below):	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see No		,,	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•	materially reducing or simplifying	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without can	celing a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
B. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	uld be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amend	dment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		considered but does NOT place	e the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered to raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOI	ELY to issues which were newl	у
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>24-44</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1,10-22	? and 45-47.		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.	
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure State		•	
	monitor i o i i troj i apei il	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
0. Other:			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

¢

**Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)** 





Application No. 009/616,616

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new method limitation added to claim 24 raises new issues which require new consideration since the Applicant had not previously limited that the fabric was formed and finished in the same operation. This limitation had not been previously searched.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the method limitations are sufficient to distinguish the Applicant's invention over the prior art. However, the Applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence that shows how the Applicant's process limitations produce a different structure from the coated fabrics taught by the prior art. What is the difference in the structure? For the method limitations to be given weight in the article claims the Applicant must provide evidence which clearly demonstrates that the method limitations produce a structurally different product. And as set forth in the Final Rejection, the Applicant has not yet provided that evidence. Therefore, the claimed method is not given patentable weight at this time and the product in rejected.

TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700